

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, applicant amends claim 10 and adds new claim 19. Claims 10-19 are presented for examination.

Section 102 rejection

The examiner rejected claims 10, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Carney* (WO 95/33350).

Claim 10, as amended, recites connecting each of the respective first connections with a respective one of the second connections via a respective common transmission path having the form of a line. *Carney* fails to disclose or suggest such a device.

Carney describes a wireless communication system in which a multi-channel digital transceiver includes a time division multiple-access (TDM) bus 16.¹ In contrast, the applicant's system provides a single line as a common transmission path for each pair of transmission and reception stages. *Carney* fails to disclose or suggest a method for transferring signals that includes "connecting each of the respective first connections with a respective one of the second connections *via a respective common transmission path having the form of a line*" as recited in the applicant's claim 10.

Claims 12 and 18 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Section 103 rejection

The examiner rejected claims 11 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carney* (WO 95/33350) in view of *Ecklund* et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,810,266).

Ecklund was filed on November 16, 1999. The current application claims priority to PCT Application No. DE99/03835 filed on December 1, 1999 which claims priority to German

¹ Abstract, lines 1-2

Applicant : Bertram Gunzelmann
Serial No. : 09/869,362
Filed : June 27, 2001
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 12816-022001 / S1107

Application No. 19860502.1 filed on December 28, 1998. Therefore, the priority date of the current application is December 28, 1998 and *Ecklund* is not prior art to the current application.

Summary

It is believed that all of the rejections have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Now pending in this application are claims 10-19, of which claim 10 is independent. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 60-1050, referencing attorney docket "12816-022001."

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/29/05



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906